

BEFORE
THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF
SOUTH CAROLINA
DOCKET NO. 89-638-C - ORDER NO. 92-170
MARCH 16, 1992

IN RE: Application of Southern Bell)	ORDER
Telephone & Telegraph Company)	APPROVING
for Revisions to its General)	RATES AND
Subscriber Service Tariff)	REQUIRING
(Tariff No. 89-171, Caller I.D.).)	FREE PER CALL
)	BLOCKING AND
)	A MONTHLY
)	CHARGE FOR
)	PER LINE
)	BLOCKING

I.

INTRODUCTION

This matter comes before the Public Service Commission of South Carolina (the Commission) pursuant to the Commission's decision to rehear the issue of the rates charged for residential and business subscribers of Caller I.D. as determined in Order No. 90-530, issued in the instant Docket on May 21, 1990, and pursuant to Commission Order No. 91-1113, issued in the instant Docket on December 12, 1991, which granted the Consumer Advocate's motion to consider per call and per line blocking during the rehearing scheduled for this matter. The main issues before the Commission in this matter were the issues of the appropriate pricing for Caller I.D. service and whether or not per call and/or per line blocking should be required as part of the provision of the

service.

II.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Southern Bell's request for Caller I.D. service in South Carolina has traveled a long and arduous course. On December 6, 1989, Southern Bell filed with the Commission its proposed revisions to its general subscriber services tariff whereby the Company proposed to offer Caller I.D. service in South Carolina. A public hearing ensued on March 14, 1990, wherein Southern Bell presented testimony in support of its Caller I.D. filing. The Consumer Advocate and the Commission Staff participated in that proceeding, but neither presented any witnesses. Thereafter, the Commission issued Order No. 90-428 on April 19, 1990, in which it approved Caller I.D. service with per line blocking for agencies or individuals involved in the business of law enforcement or such agencies as domestic violence intervention agencies. The Commission denied the Consumer Advocate's proposal of per call blocking. By Order No. 90-530, issued May 21, 1990, the Commission denied in part and granted in part the Consumer Advocate's Petition for Rehearing and Reconsideration. Specifically, the Commission denied the Consumer Advocate's request to rule on the legality of Caller I.D. but granted the Consumer Advocate's Petition in regard to a rehearing for the "limited purpose of considering the rates charged for residential and business customers with Caller I.D." On June 7, 1990, the Commission issued Order No. 90-574 in the instant Docket which granted the Commission Staff's and the

Consumer Advocate's separately filed Motions for Stay of the Caller I.D. service "until the legality of Caller I.D. service is resolved in the Courts of this State."

Thereafter, Southern Bell instituted its declaratory judgment action in the Richland County Court of Common Pleas, 90-CP-40-2686. Following a ruling by the Circuit Court favorable to Southern Bell, the issue was appealed to the Supreme Court by the Consumer Advocate. The State Supreme Court ruled that Caller I.D. service, as proposed by Southern Bell, did not violate the wiretap statutes of South Carolina and that the service did not result in the invasion of any citizen's privacy interests.

Following the Supreme Court's decision, the Consumer Advocate filed a Motion with the Commission requesting the Commission to consider per call and per line blocking options for customers of Southern Bell when Caller I.D. and other similar services are approved for implementation in South Carolina. Southern Bell filed a Return in Opposition to the Motion filed by the Consumer Advocate. The Commission granted the Consumer Advocate's Motion in Order No. 91-1113, issued December 12, 1991. In Order No. 91-1113, the Commission recognized that in Order No. 90-428, the Commission denied the Consumer Advocate's request for per call blocking as a condition precedent to the Caller I.D. service being provided. However, the Commission recognized that subsequent events in other jurisdictions was sufficient reason to consider the issue of per call and per line blocking in the already scheduled hearing for the purpose of the cost and rate issues. All parties

in this Docket received copies of the Commission's decision in this matter to consider per call and per line blocking.

Thereafter, the public hearing was held on January 6, 1992, at 2:30 p.m. in the Commission's Hearing Room, the Honorable Marjorie Amos-Frazier, presiding. William F. Austin, Esquire, and Fred A. Walters, Esquire, represented Southern Bell; Steven W. Hamm, Esquire, Raymon E. Lark, Jr., Esquire, and Elliott F. Elam, Jr., Esquire, represented the Consumer Advocate; and Marsha A. Ward, General Counsel, represented the Commission Staff.

Southern Bell presented the testimony of Sharon A. Etheridge, Operations Manager in the Economic Analysis Department of BellSouth Telecommunications. On rebuttal, Southern Bell presented John F. Dorsch, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., Operations Manager, Regulatory. The Consumer Advocate presented the testimony of Dr. Mark N. Cooper, President, Citizens Research, in support of its position. The Commission Staff presented Gary E. Walsh, Assistant Director of the Utilities Division, in support of its position.

III.

RES JUDICATA AND ISSUE PRECLUSION

Southern Bell asserts that the doctrines of res judicata and issue preclusion bar the Commission from entertaining the issues of per call and per line blocking since the Commission has already heard and ruled on those matters in its Order No. 90-428.

Southern Bell, in its brief, states that the doctrine of res judicata stands for the principle that the public interest requires an end to litigation and that the litigant has a right not to be

sued twice for the same cause of action. Southern Bell asserts for the doctrine to apply, the following elements must be present: (1) identities of the parties; (2) identity of the subject matter; and (3) an adjudication in the former suit of the questions sought to be raised in the record suit. Southern Bell contends that all elements are present here. All parties are the same, the subject matter, i.e., the issue of blocking, is the same and there has been a final adjudication on the issue from which no appeal was taken.

The Commission has considered Southern Bell's objection on the issue of res judicata and notes that it initially denied Southern Bell's objection on those grounds during the course of the hearing. However, Southern Bell made a continuing objection and so the Commission must rule on this issue at the onset. The Commission finds that Southern Bell's application of the principle of res judicata is misplaced for several reasons. First, the proceeding before the Commission is not "litigation" in the civil sense of the word. The Commission proceeding is establishing a service sought to be provided by Southern Bell and establishing certain policies in regard to the provision of that service. Secondly, Southern Bell is not being "sued" in this cause of action. Rather, the Commission is considering, after notice to Southern Bell, a certain policy issue, specifically, the issue of blocking. The Commission also notes that this "litigation" is not over since this proceeding before the Commission is still in the same Docket from which the Commission's original decision in Order No. 90-428 was issued. Fourth, it is the Commission's opinion that if Southern Bell had

wished to challenge the Commission's decision to consider the issue of blocking, it should have challenged Order No. 91-1113. Southern Bell did not challenge that Order by filing a Petition for Reconsideration or otherwise exhausting its administrative remedies and now must abide by the Commission's decision to consider those issues. Fifth, S.C. Code Ann. §58-9-1180 allows the Commission, after notice, to rescind or amend any order or decision made by it. The Commission has the authority to modify or amend its own orders. Hamm v. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., et.al., ___ S.C. ___, 394 S.E.2d 842 (1990). The Commission did not violate the doctrine of res judicata or issue preclusion by deciding to consider the policy issue of blocking in this matter.

IV.

TESTIMONY OF CONSUMER ADVOCATE WITNESS COOPER

Southern Bell challenged the admissibility of the Consumer Advocate's witness Cooper on a variety of grounds. Southern Bell challenged the testimony of witness Cooper on the basis that he was not proffered as an expert witness, that the studies upon which Dr. Cooper relied were improperly introduced as hearing exhibits in violation of Hamm v. Southern Bell, 406 S.E.2d 157 (S.C. 1991), that the same exhibits, identified as numbers 6 through 13 should not be admitted into evidence based on the "Best Evidence Rule," that witness Cooper was not permitted to use opinion poll testimony or draw conclusions therefrom under Rule 43(m) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure (SCRCP) and that such opinion polls relied upon by witness Cooper amounted to hearsay and should

not be introduced into evidence.

A. Expert Status of Consumer Advocate's Witness.

Southern Bell challenged Dr. Cooper's status as an expert in this proceeding. Southern Bell contended at the hearing that Dr. Cooper had not been tendered as an expert witness; that he was tendered as a lay witness; and Southern Bell objected to this lay witness offering opinion testimony. The Consumer Advocate pointed out that Dr. Cooper is a recognized expert in the statistical and research field; he has formed Citizens Research; and he has testified at approximately a dozen hearings regarding Caller I.D. on this same topic in other jurisdictions.

Rule 43(m) of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure allows expert testimony,

[i]f scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge will assist the trier of fact to understand the evidence or to determine a fact in issue, a witness qualified as an expert by knowledge, skill, experience, training, or education, may testify thereto in the form of an opinion or otherwise.

The issue before the Commission was whether or not per line and/or per call blocking should be required in the provision of Caller I.D. service. Dr. Cooper's specialized knowledge on Caller I.D. would assist the Commission in making its determination as to whether or not some form of blocking would be appropriate. Therefore, Dr. Cooper's educational background, his experience from Citizens Research and experience as Director of Research at the Consumer Federation of America and his knowledge from participation in Caller I.D. proceedings in other jurisdictions eminently

qualify him as an expert in the area of Caller I.D. Southern Bell's objections on that basis are overruled.

B. Relevancy of Dr. Cooper's Testimony.

Southern Bell objected to certain portions of Dr. Cooper's testimony being admitted into evidence as not being relevant to the proceeding. According to Southern Bell, the Order establishing this hearing and allowing the consideration of the blocking issue requires that subsequent events should be looked at to determine whether or not Southern Bell should be required to provide blocking. The Commission has considered the objection of Southern Bell and viewed it in light of Commission Order No. 91-1113 issued in the instant Docket. While the events cited in the Consumer Advocate's Motion relate to new evidence, developments regarding the provision of per call per line blocking, and decisions by other jurisdictions that have ruled on the issue of per call and per line blocking subsequent to the Commission's initial decision in this matter, the Commission did not limit the scope of the proceeding to only those events or decisions that have taken place subsequent to Order No. 90-428 approving Southern Bell's Caller I.D. tariff filing on April 19, 1990. The decisions of other jurisdictions, while possibly taking place after the Commission's decision in Order No. 90-428, arose from facts and circumstances which possibly predate this Commission's decision. Therefore, there was no limitation in the scope of information that would be relevant to this Caller I.D. proceeding. Southern Bell's objection in this regard is overruled.

Southern Bell also objected on the ground of the relevancy of using statistical analysis and opinion polls of other jurisdictions to demonstrate the applicability in South Carolina. The Commission has considered the objection by Southern Bell as well as the information sought to be admitted into evidence. The Commission is of the opinion that the information objected to is relevant to the proceeding to show consumer attitudes towards Caller I.D. and blocking. That is not to say that that would be the same attitude and opinions in South Carolina, but since there is no similar survey of South Carolina consumers, the information is relevant as to customer attitudes. Southern Bell's objection in that regard is overruled.

C. The Violation of the "Best Evidence Rule".

Southern Bell contends that the studies sought to be admitted with Dr. Cooper's testimony violate the "Best Evidence Rule". Southern Bell contends that for a study to be introduced, it must either be an original or a certified true and correct copy of that original. Xeroxed copies of a document, according to Southern Bell, would be inadmissible. While raising the objection, Southern Bell does not raise any genuine question as to the documents' authenticity or state why it would be unfair to admit a duplicate. There has been no question raised as to whether or not the documents sought to be admitted are authentic, therefore, the Commission sees no reason to require the original study or a certified true and correct copy. Southern Bell's objection on the grounds of the Best Evidence Rule is overruled.

D. Opinion Poll Testimony

Southern bell objects to the introduction of certain exhibits and testimony of witness Cooper relating to several opinion polls which were conducted in other jurisdictions relating to Caller I.D. and privacy issues. According to Southern Bell, under SCRCF Rule 43(m), expert testimony may be offered only under limited means. However, the Commission has qualified Dr. Cooper as an expert and to that extent, his testimony is generally admissible. However, under Southern Bell's objections to Dr. Cooper's testimony based on hearsay, the Commission must limit certain aspects of Dr. Cooper's testimony. Specifically, Hearing Exhibit Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 are not admissible for hearsay reasons. Specifically, Hearing Exhibit Nos. 7 and 8 are only partial documents from other jurisdictions and the studies were not conducted by Dr. Cooper. Hearing Exhibit Nos. 6 and 9, while apparently complete documents, were not conducted by Dr. Cooper. There was no showing that the proper universe was examined, that a representative sample was drawn from that universe and that the mode of questioning the interviewer was correct. Additionally, there was no showing that the persons conducting the survey were experts, that the data gathered was accurately reported and that the sample design, the questionnaire and the interviewing were in accordance with generally accepted standards of objective procedures and the statistics in the field of such surveys. For those reasons then, Hearing Exhibit Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 must be excluded from the evidence and Dr. Cooper's testimony relating to such surveys and opinion polls should also be

excluded.

Hearing Exhibit No. 10 is a memo between two BellSouth employees. That exhibit is admissible since it is the Company's own document. Hearing Exhibit No. 11 is also admissible since it is a Consumer Advocate response to Southern Bell's Interrogatory No. 1-2.

Hearing Exhibit No. 12, which is a Caller I.D. call blocking study conducted by BSS Market Research and Analysis for BellSouth Services Lines of Business is admissible. This document was admitted under seal as being proprietary and the Commission will continue its proprietary treatment, but will consider the information in the study.

As to Hearing Exhibit 13, which is the transcript from the Caller I.D. proceeding in Maryland, the Commission hereby takes judicial notice of that proceeding. A true copy of the proceeding is not required for the Commission to take judicial notice.

V.

COMMISSION STAFF'S TESTIMONY

Southern Bell objected to the introduction of Commission Staff witness Walsh's exhibit which was a survey of 43 other regulatory agencies as to the status of Caller I.D. in those states. Southern Bell objected to the admission of such an exhibit on the basis of hearsay and that there is no exception to the general rule against hearsay. However, the Commission finds that such information contained in witness Walsh's exhibit should be admitted into evidence. First, as requested by the Commission counsel, the

information contained in Mr. Walsh's exhibit is subject to judicial notice by the Commission. The information is merely the status of Caller I.D. in other jurisdictions across the country of which the Commission may take notice. Additionally, the information contained in the exhibit meets exceptions to the rule against hearsay evidence. Specifically, the information could be considered a public record or report or a business record. First, the Commission, as well as the Commission Staff, has a duty to be aware of and keep informed of regulatory issues across the country. Therefore, Staff's survey of other jurisdiction's treatment of Caller I.D. falls within the public record exception to hearsay. Additionally, such information is kept in the course of the Commission's regularly conducted business activities and the Commission Staff regularly obtains similar information on other issues from other jurisdictions. Therefore, the information in Commission Staff witness Walsh's exhibit, meets both the public records exception and the business records exception (See S.C. Code Ann. §19-5-510 (1976), as amended) to hearsay.

Southern Bell also objected to certain statements in witness Walsh's testimony. Specifically, Southern Bell objected to certain testimony relating to witness Walsh's comments on his exhibit. Based on the Commission's ruling that the exhibit met the exception to hearsay and could be judicially noticed, Southern Bell's objections in that regard are overruled. Southern Bell also objected to witness Walsh's testimony beginning on page 3, line 22 through page 5, line 5 on the basis of there were no underlying

studies to support his conclusions, that such testimony was in violation of Hamm v. Southern Bell, supra, and that the statements were based upon hearsay. The Commission has considered the Company's objection and finds that it should be overruled. The Commission Staff offered the North Carolina Commission Order as Hearing Exhibit No. 17 for the Commission to take judicial notice. The "hearsay" in question are direct quotes from the North Carolina Public Utilities Commission May 31, 1991 order. The rest of Mr. Walsh's testimony contains the status of Caller I.D. and blocking issues in other jurisdictions, and based upon the Commission's ruling in that regard is admissible. Southern Bell objects to other portions of witness Walsh's testimony on the basis of res judicata and issue preclusion. Based upon the Commission's previous discussion of those issues, Southern Bell's objection in that regard is overruled.

VI.

RATES FOR CALLER I.D. SERVICE

The Company presented the testimony of Sharon A. Etheridge who described the methodology and appropriateness of the central office cost study for the provision of Caller ID service in South Carolina and discussed the pricing consideration for Caller ID service. Witness Etheridge indicated that the cost study reflects all the forward looking, long run incremental costs associated with the provision of Caller ID service and indicted that these long run incremental costs are the appropriate floor to use as a test when making pricing decisions. The cost studies associated with Caller

ID were submitted by Company as Hearing Exhibit Nos. 4 and 5. Additionally, witness Etheridge provided testimony concerning the proposed rate schedule for Caller ID. The proposed rate schedule for Caller ID service was a banded rate structure which consists of minimum and maximum rates. The minimum rate, which is the low end of the rate band, is proposed to cover the Company's forward looking long run incremental costs and to provide a contribution to basic local exchange service. Witness Etheridge testified that the levelized monthly cost per line for Caller ID service in South Carolina is \$4.01 for residence service and \$3.82 for business service. The Company's proposed initial rate for the service is \$7.50 per residence access line and \$10.00 per business access line. There was no opposition presented to witness Etheridge's testimony during this proceeding.

VII.

WHETHER OR NOT PER CALL AND/OR PER LINE BLOCKING SHOULD BE ALLOWED

While the Supreme Court of the State of South Carolina has found that Caller I.D. does not violate the State's trap and trace laws, nor does it violate any right to privacy, the Public Service Commission may still determine on a policy basis how this service should be provided to the public. The Commission heard the testimony of the Company, the Consumer Advocate, and the Commission Staff on the issue of blocking. The Commission, additionally, is aware and takes note that in its Order No. 90-428 approving Caller I.D., the Commission only required per line blocking in the limited circumstances of law enforcement or crisis prevention type

agencies. However, the Commission has determined, in light of the treatment of Caller I.D. in other jurisdictions and other information provided during the hearing, that the Commission should consider the issues of per call and per line blocking.

Caller I.D. service consists of automatic disclosure of a calling party's telephone number as an aid in identifying the calling party before a call is answered. Southern Bell asserts that the service, as it is proposed, can enhance the privacy, security, or efficiency of residential or business telephone subscribers by discouraging annoying, obscene or threatening telephone calls.

According to the testimony of Consumer Advocate witness Cooper, Caller I.D. represents a fundamental change in the nature of telephone service. It takes control of the telephone number away from the calling party and gives it to the party receiving the call. According to witness Cooper, patterns of telecommunications have been built on the assumption of control over the dissemination of one's telephone number. There are a host of situations in which the average person wants to place a call without revealing his or her telephone number. When Caller I.D. robs them of that ability, the social cost is a disruption of communications patterns; the economic cost is the expense to consumers of restoring their control over the dissemination of their telephone number. Witness Cooper recommended that an additional function be included in the Touchstar family of services. That function is known as number forward blocking. Number forward blocking on a per call basis

(otherwise known as per call blocking) will meet the needs of many subscribers. However, witness Cooper recognized that there is a small percentage of customers that may need per line blocking (which would block all calls placed from a specific access line) either because of the frequency with which they will block or the dire consequences of accidentally forwarding a number. Dr. Cooper recommended that free per call blocking be available to all subscribers on all calls and that an option for per line blocking be available for those who desire it.

According to Dr. Cooper, the call recipient, even with number forward blocking, will still have a greatly enhanced capacity to manage incoming calls as a result of the SS7 technology. Dr. Cooper was of the opinion that number forward blocking, as he recommends it, preserves the basic benefit of Caller I.D. It allows emergency service providers to see the telephone number of those in need of the assistance and it does not significantly diminish the ability of the new technology to deter harassing or annoying calls. Meanwhile, the blocking provides a significant benefit to the vast body of subscribers by allowing them to preserve the control over publication of their telephone numbers while preserving the functionality and usefulness of the overall SS7 technology.

Dr. Cooper also provided information that Commissions in the states of Delaware, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Kentucky, and Illinois, required per call blocking at a minimum. Dr. Cooper noted that free per call blocking has been offered by Bell

Pennsylvania. In Vermont, the former Bell Telephone Company (New England Telephone, a subsidiary of NYNEX) is offering per call blocking. In Iowa, the former Bell Company, U.S. West, is offering blocking. Other states have also ordered blocking, including North Carolina, Indiana, Nevada, New York, and California. Dr. Cooper also stated that four of the seven regional Bell companies are offering or intending to offer blocking, as are several of the independents.

Dr. Cooper testified that the option of per call blocking has the least effect on the offering of Caller I.D. service. This option would require each telephone subscriber to activate number forward blocking before dialing a call if the transmission of the calling number is not desired. This method places the burden on the consumer to exercise control over the dissemination of his telephone number on a call-by-call basis. The other option possible, per line blocking, would prevent the transmission of numbers on all calls made from a blocked line.

Dr. Cooper testified that in the State of Maryland, the actual experience of having the service available in the community was attested during a public hearing. The public hearing in that matter evidenced that 40% of the people had a problem with Caller I.D., while 60% of the people did not. The Maryland Commission, according to Dr. Cooper, as did a number of other commissions, chose to seek a policy that would balance the disruptive impact of Caller I.D. against the need for the service. The policy adopted in the State of Maryland was per call blocking.

Commission Staff witness Walsh provided information that in those jurisdictions having approved Caller I.D. without blocking, complaints have come from customers who have subscribed to a company's non-published (private) numbers. According to Mr. Walsh, the introduction of Caller I.D. without blocking has made it possible for the disclosure of non-published telephone numbers to called parties. Without blocking, the value of non-published number service will be reduced to subscribers of those services. Mr. Walsh stated that the non-published telephone number customers subscribe to this service to protect their telephone numbers from being disclosed. Per-call blocking, according to Mr. Walsh, will in many instances function similarly to non-published telephone number service because per call blocking would allow a customer the option of allowing or disallowing the disclosure of his number to a called party. Mr. Walsh further recommended that per call blocking should be provided to the general subscriber body. While Mr. Walsh noted that there are other methods to bypass the disclosure of one's telephone number, those methods, while effective, require the customer to expend additional money or time or be inconvenienced to protect his number. Mr. Walsh stated that this would be unfair to telephone subscribers in South Carolina and that per call blocking at no charge would be an appropriate mechanism for providing protection against the disclosure of the calling party's number.

Southern Bell presented the testimony of John Dorsch to rebut the conclusions drawn by witness Cooper and the testimony of

Commission Staff witness Walsh. Mr. Dorsch testified that the conclusions of the Consumer Advocate witness and Staff witness were based upon data that was accumulated years ago, often before Caller I.D. service was even deployed in the states in which the study was done, and that these witnesses' recommendations are directly contrary to the decision of the Commission already rendered in this docket and from which no appeal was taken. To the extent that Mr. Dorsch's testimony addresses studies already excluded by the Commission in this decision, the Commission need not rely on that portion of Mr. Dorsch's testimony. To that extent then, Hearing Exhibit No. 19 should be excluded from evidence. The portion of Mr. Dorsch's testimony dealing with the issues of res judicata and issue preclusion have been previously addressed.

VIII.

FINDINGS

The Commission has considered the allowable exhibits in the record, the allowable portions of Dr. Cooper's testimony, the testimony of Commission Staff witness Walsh, and the testimony of Company witnesses Etheridge and Dorsch and makes the following findings of fact:

1. Both the Consumer Advocate and the Commission Staff recommend that Caller I.D. be provided with free per call blocking. Under this option, the calling party would have an affirmative duty to activate blocking before dialing each call if he wishes to prevent dissemination of his calling number to Caller I.D. subscribers. This gives customers the option of disseminating

their number or taking an additional step to keep the number private. The called party would also be aware, through the per call blocking option, that the calling party has blocked his telephone number.

2. The Consumer Advocate recommends that the Commission also approve per line blocking to prevent the transmission of numbers on all calls made from that line on a subscription basis to those who need or desire it free of charge. The Consumer Advocate recommends in his brief that at a minimum, the Commission should approve this service free or at a reduced charge for unlisted and non-published numbers and for all others, for either an initial fee or minimal monthly charges.

3. That a minimal charge for per line blocking would provide a contribution to local service.

4. That per line blocking would be optional, i.e., the customer could choose the free per call blocking feature and dial the proper code to block each call or could pay a minimum monthly charge to block every call without dialing a code.

5. Blocking of telephone numbers would not have a significant impact on the value of Caller I.D. service. While a significant minority of customers polled indicated that the service would be less valuable, similarly, a majority of business subscribers and a significant number of residence subscribers stated that it made no difference if anyone could have their number blocked. Hearing Exhibit No. 12.

6. Other jurisdictions have approved Caller I.D. with

various blocking options including only per call blocking, per call and per line blocking, per call blocking for all customers and per line blocking for emergency agencies, and no blocking at all.

7. No party opposed the proposed rates and charges for Caller I.D. service.

IX.

CONCLUSIONS

1. That per call blocking be available to all subscribers free of charge.

2. That the Commission concludes it is not necessary to provide per line blocking free of charge since any customer has the option of per call blocking, therefore, per line blocking will be made available at a \$2.00 per month per line option to all customers and will provide a contribution to local basic service.

3. That per line blocking shall remain in effect as originally ordered by the Commission in Order No. 90-428 relating to law enforcement and crisis prevention type agencies.

4. That the rates and charges for Caller I.D. service as filed by the Company should be approved.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. That the rates and charges for Caller I.D. service should be approved as filed.

2. That per call blocking shall be offered to all Southern Bell subscribers at no charge and that per line blocking be available at a \$2.00 per month per line charge to all subscribers.


3. That the law enforcement and crisis prevention type agencies shall continue to receive free per line blocking as originally ordered.

4. That Southern Bell should file tariffs reflecting the modifications approved herein within thirty (30) days of the date of this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED:


Chairman

ATTEST:


Executive Director

(SEAL)